

PRR

*The Department of State*

# bulletin

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

Vol. XIX, No. 490

November 21, 1948

- GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERS STEPS FOR  
REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS** • Statement by  
*Frederick H. Osborn*..... 630
- ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO ENTER  
TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS**..... 642
- NATURAL RESOURCES IN A WORLD OF CON-  
FLICT** • Article by *Paul H. Nitze*..... 625



*For complete contents see back cover*



# *The Department of State* bulletin

VOL. XIX, No. 490 • PUBLICATION 3346

November 21, 1948

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.*

*Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.*

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:  
52 issues, domestic \$5, foreign \$7.25  
Single copy, 15 cents

Published with the approval of the  
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

DEC 2 '48

## NATURAL RESOURCES IN A WORLD OF CONFLICT

*by Paul H. Nitze*

Deputy to the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs

There is today widespread concern as to the adequacy of natural resources to support the world's increasing population. Malthus has come back into fashion, and Malthusian gloom pervades many of our discussions of trends in other parts of the world and of the effectiveness of the international policies we adopt. It will perhaps give a little perspective to this problem if I recall a talk I had with Sir Montagu Norman in 1932, when he was Governor of the Bank of England. He felt then that the basic problem in the world was overproduction, that technical advances in production had been so rapid that the world as a whole was experiencing a crisis arising out of almost universal overproduction. Moreover, he thought that such a condition would be chronic for the foreseeable future.

It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that Sir Montagu's analysis was only a partial analysis of an extremely complex pattern of interrelated factors and that he overemphasized the abundance of resources and ignored the possibility of a well-functioning economy and a great war, causing a scarcity of resources. It seems to me that there is an opposite danger of a partial analysis based on an assumption that this scarcity of natural resources will be extreme. Oversimplification is a constant hazard in this infinitely complicated field.

One point is crystal clear, however, and that is that we should not shy away from the facts. We should examine such facts as are available to us to the best of our ability. Then, having ascertained the facts, or at least as many as we can, we should develop a positive program of action that holds out realistic prospects of accomplishment and attempt to carry it out. Although we must not hesitate to

develop a program and carry it out, we must all the time maintain a certain degree of humility as to our ability to foresee how the various interrelated factors will in fact work themselves out. Unpredicted and unpredictable events abound, especially when human beings are involved, and this problem of the relation of man to his resource environment is just as much a human problem as it is a natural-resource problem.

Considering first the nonrenewable resources, one of the hard facts of life is that the minerals necessary for a highly developed civilization can be drawn from the earth in only limited quantities. Some are located at such depths, at such places, and in such combinations as to make them extremely difficult or even impossible to obtain. Furthermore, the minerals that we do know about and can get at without too much difficulty are distributed around the world in a haphazard fashion, from the point of view of human use.

It would be comforting if, once we got minerals out of the ground, we could keep on using them indefinitely. But there is much permanent loss, ranging from total loss, in the case of fuels, to only slight loss—for example, in the case of lead used in storage batteries. At present rates of consumption, there is an appreciable drain on the known mineral resources of the world.

The facts about renewable natural resources are more complex, but it seems to be generally agreed that unless thoroughgoing conservation measures are widely employed, erosion, soil exhaustion, deforestation, lower water tables, silting up of streams, and related developments will soon bring results which would be even more serious than the permanent loss of certain of our mineral resources.



Against these broad natural-resource facts we have the facts of population. The world's population increased from 400 millions in the sixteenth century to some 800 millions in the nineteenth, and is now estimated at approximately 2,200 millions. Population growth generally changes only slowly and as a result of complex factors. A substantial change in world population trends in the next few decades is not probable. Even a decline in the annual increments is unlikely for a considerable time to come. By the end of this century, the world's population may be close to 3 billion people.

The situation is quite different in various parts of the world. First, there are the countries of incipient population stability, namely the countries of Western Europe and North America. Second, there are the countries of transitional growth, including the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe generally, much of Latin America, and Japan. Third, there are the countries with a high growth potential, especially China and India.

Certain interesting comparisons can be made among these three types of countries. The first and second types each have one fifth of the population of the world; the third type has three fifths. In type 1, the median age is about 35 years and the life expectancy at birth is about 60 years; in type 2, the median age is about 25 years and the life expectancy is about 50; in type 3, the median age is about 20 years and the life expectancy is between 30 and 40 years. These are striking differences. Birth rates are falling rapidly in types 1 and 2, but not in type 3. Death rates are low and fairly constant in type 1, falling rapidly in type 2, and continuing high in type 3. The likely developments of the coming years, namely declining birth rates and low or declining death rates in the more advanced countries, but mainly declining death rates in the less developed areas, which already have well over half the world's population, will mean a somewhat smaller percentage of the world's population for the type 1, or, generally speaking, the western countries, and a somewhat larger percentage for types 2 and 3, especially 3. This is a political-economic fact, or probable fact, that must always be borne in mind.

It is clear that the United States will gradually come to have a smaller percentage of the people of the world. This may make our own problem of adaptation to limited resources easier than for

the world as a whole, especially in view of the high productivity of our people.

There is another important aspect of the population and resources problem, which is sometimes overlooked. During the last 100 years or so, production and consumption, as well as population, have increased greatly. At the same time democracy and popular education have advanced rapidly. The result has been a tremendous rise in aspirations for the good things of life, in the material as well as the spiritual realm, on the part of the great mass of people over the world. People are not satisfied with their present lot. They want more things to eat, wear, and enjoy now. "Pie in the sky by and by" seems to have less appeal than it perhaps once did. Moreover, people in many countries have sufficient political power to make their wants felt. Governments are under obligation to do something to improve the lot of the common man. Whether the resource base exists for providing the rapidly increasing populations with the high levels of physical consumption they desire is a real question. If not, political stability will depend to a considerable extent on people adjusting their consumption sights to something within the range of practical possibilities.

Another factor bringing pressure on natural resources is of course the need for military establishments. War is expensive in terms of natural resources as well as human, and the exhaustible mineral resources are especially hard hit in this day of industrialized warfare. The present moment is not a happy one for predicting an immediate decline in the military drain on resources.

It is too bad that there is not an annual or quinquennial volume that lists all the natural resources of the world and tells where they are and how much there is of them. Such a volume would probably not be generally accepted as authoritative and for a very good reason. Natural resource is in part a relative term. It has meaning only in the context of the potential use to which we think the resource can be put. The nitrogen in the air, the gold in the sea, or the minerals of the core of the earth are not counted as part of our natural resources. In a very real sense, resources do not exist unless we are resourceful enough to find ways and means of using them. Differences of opinion as to what resources exist and the technical and economic possibilities of converting them to man's



use are such as to make authoritative cataloging difficult.

The relativity of the concept of "natural resources" must always be kept in mind. For example, titanium, which was formerly important largely because it was an obnoxious impurity in steel manufacture, has in recent years become an important substitute for lead in the manufacture of paint, and now that an economical process has been found for refining it into a pure metal, titanium ore deposits, once a drug on the market, may come to have strategic significance.

During the war the Office of Imports of the Foreign Economic Administration was largely concerned with the procurement of strategic materials abroad and the preclusive buying of materials to deny them to the enemy. Some consideration was also given, however, to the foreseeable raw-materials problems which would arise during the peace. In that connection, our various commodity experts were asked to estimate the remaining world resources of the various metals and minerals which they were engaged in procuring. The most competent were generally the most reluctant to set a figure down in black and white because of the almost interminable qualifying footnotes that would have had to be added to explain exactly what the figure meant and what it did not mean.

Quite apart from this problem of the relativity of natural resources are two other stumbling blocks to adequate knowledge about the quantity of natural resources. One is that it takes a considerable amount of high-quality human resources and some other facilities to collect resource information. The other, a sad one, is that certain governments shoot people who divulge even to their own citizens much about resources in their countries.

In spite of these difficulties, one can say something about the resource position of the world and the United States. It is convenient to continue the distinction between renewable and nonrenewable resources.

Of the renewable, nothing compares with soils in importance. The broad fact here is that topsoil builds up slowly, and through neglect and careless agricultural practices the world is losing a great amount of valuable topsoil. We in the United States, it is believed, take better care of our land than do people in many countries, although we are still behind a number of coun-

tries in soil-conservation practice. Despite this, the war and postwar years have seen tremendous accomplishments by United States agriculture, based on improved practices, better seeds, and new techniques that have made these accomplishments possible. Without them the United States would have been in no position to help other countries of the world avoid mass starvation and the resulting economic and political chaos.

The most immediate concern of the United States is the minerals field. In general this country is well endowed with mineral resources. It is this endowment which has, among other things, made it possible for the 7 percent of the world's population in the United States to produce 40 percent of the world's goods. Without this endowment we could not have shipped abroad some 140 million tons of military and other equipment during the war.

Today there are many shortages of mineral supplies in the United States. The Bureau of Mines has estimated our commercial mineral reserves in relation to the 1935-39 annual rate of use. The United States has no commercial reserves of flake graphite, quartz crystals, industrial diamonds, tin, and nickel. Our commercial reserves have been estimated at one year for chromite, 2 years for manganese, 3 for asbestos and mercury, 4 for platinum and tungsten, 7 for vanadium, 9 for bauxite, 12 for lead, 19 for zinc, and 34 for copper. Since that time prices have advanced substantially, probably throwing additional ore into the commercial class. On the other hand, further depletion has taken place, and the 1935-39 rate of use has been found to be at least 30 percent under current annual requirements, even with all the technological improvements in consumption that enable us to stretch our supplies.

The pressures arising from a growing shortage of high-grade mineral reserves are bound to have far-reaching effects on our domestic economy, and to some extent abroad. The case of the imminent exhaustion of the high-grade Mesabi iron ores is a good example. Already northern New York iron mines, once abandoned, are being reopened; experimental work is going forward rapidly in the beneficiation of lower grade iron ores; production from deposits in North Africa is increasing; projects are under way or under consideration in Brazil, in Venezuela, and in Liberia. The recov-

ery of iron and steel scrap has taken on a new importance, and negotiations have just been completed with the United Kingdom which should result in steel scrap moving from Germany to the United States. Improvements in the steel-making processes are being stimulated. The problem will be met, but only by the application of a vast amount of technical and other energies.

Similarly, in other segments of the metals field, serious problems are arising that require new technical developments, the substitution of a more plentiful metal for a less plentiful, more economical forms of utilization, and above all a far greater emphasis upon the recovery of scrap. In the long run we must reduce the wastage of nonrenewable resources to an absolute minimum. Such a reduction does not necessarily mean a halt in the increase in our standard of living; but it does mean a much more intelligent use of the resources which we have. As an illustration of what can be done, we remember our amazement and distress at discovering, just after the war, that Germany had been able to triple its war production between 1942 and 1945 with no substantial increase in its raw materials, but just by more efficient use of those materials. This effort was largely made by redesign of equipment and new techniques of production.

Our fuels are used up when they are burnt, and no recovery as scrap is possible. Fortunately, our coal reserves are very great, and by and large those of other countries are also of long life. Our oil reserves are not in such a happy position, although much has been done to improve extraction techniques. For the immediate future the rapid development of Middle Eastern reserves should ease the tight world petroleum situation. In the long run the problem would not be so great in the energy field if water, solar, atomic, or wind sources could be harnessed in adequate volume. It is clear that an increase in the energy base of the world economy is fundamental to sustained large-scale advance.

Up to this point only passing reference has been made to the ways of mitigating or actually improving what looks to some like the sad long-run plight of the human race. Now let us see what are or might become mitigating factors and how practicable they would appear to be.

Of the ways in which the seriousness of this world situation might conceivably be mitigated,

some are not within our power to do very much about at the present time. One is a rapid decline in population or even a rapid decline in the rate of increase of population. Another is large-scale movements of population. Another is a general reduction of people's desires for the things of this world which involve, directly or indirectly, drains on scarce natural resources. A fourth is a significant reduction of the amount of resources going to military establishments.

There are certain other ways of mitigating the impact of resource shortages that it is within our power to do something about. Improved techniques for resource development and conservation, even on the basis of current knowledge if widely applied, hold substantial prospects for mitigating the problem. The results of such application may not be estimated now statistically, but concern for natural resources would be much less panicky if existing knowledge were being fully put to practical use.

To accomplish this result, four basic things seem to be required. The first is knowledge; the second is wide dissemination of that knowledge; the third is the appropriate organizational techniques for efficiently implementing that knowledge; and the fourth is sufficient capital, or to put it another way, enough excess of productive effort over current consumption to enable us to execute the actual projects involved.

On all four counts, the United States is in a favorable situation, compared with the rest of the world. We are fortunate in one further respect, the freedom from internal barriers within the United States to a free movement of knowledge, of people, of goods, and of the capital necessary for resource development and conservation.

Optimum conservation and utilization of resources cannot, however, be adequately achieved by domestic measures alone, either in the United States or in any other nation. On the international front also there are important fields for action, involving international trade, international capital movements, and international diffusion of scientific and technical knowledge.

Consider trade first. Many of the particular resource shortages of the United States are today being met by imports from abroad. As resources are further developed in other countries, we hope that increased imports will be possible. The United States is today, however, exporting a far

larger total volume of goods than it imports. This is true not only in a dollar sense but also in the sense of the resources that go into the goods purchased with these dollars.

At the time of the congressional consideration of the European Recovery Program, the capacity of the natural-resource position of the United States to withstand the drain involved was considered. After consideration, it was felt that we could stand the drain, and the program was approved. The point is, however, that there are practical limits to the extent to which we can export our resources without receiving comparable imports.

Reflecting our concern on this point, both the Executive Branch of the Government and the Congress felt it wise to attach to the rendering of economic assistance to Europe the condition that the recipient countries cooperate with us in making available reasonable quantities of materials expected to be in long-term short supply in the United States. Again, our stockpiling program is part of our attempt to insure adequate supplies of strategic resources in case international trade should be disrupted by war. In any commodity agreements we may negotiate, it is obvious that our special interest will be that available supplies should be adequate for our needs.

In the long run it is our belief that not only we but all other countries stand to benefit from a relatively free and equitable exchange of goods in international trade. The uneven distribution of resources of each country is to some extent overcome by such trade. This is a major purpose of the projected International Trade Organization.

The importance of international trade in this whole problem area is also a result of the greater international specialization of labor that it makes possible. Development is thus concentrated on the most economic resources, with higher living levels brought about by the resulting greater productivity in all areas. Greater productivity may not lessen the total drain on resources, but it certainly lessens the impact of growing populations on particular resources. International trade has never been developed sufficiently to permit us to judge how large a contribution it could make to well-being. It is tempting to believe that the difference in the levels of living between Western Europe and the United States derives to a very large extent from the existence of barriers to trade among the Western European states, in contrast to

the comparative lack of such barriers between the States of the United States. This belief, of course, lies behind our strong encouragement of European economic cooperation.

In spite of the importance of international trade, it is going to be difficult in the coming years to maintain a large and increasing volume of international trade. It will be an uphill struggle, even with a functioning International Trade Organization. Many countries believe that their economic salvation lies in less, rather than more, trade, because they think more trade increases their vulnerability to instabilities elsewhere, specifically depressions or wars, and because they think they can develop themselves internally more rapidly by insulating themselves to a considerable extent. In attempting both to insulate themselves from international economic instability and to develop as rapidly as possible, many countries severely limit their imports of certain products, compete avidly for such other imports as steel, machinery, and equipment needed for industrialization and already in short supply; and soon face internal inflation which kills their exports, industrial bottlenecks arising in their extraordinarily complex economic development, and a desperate need for large-scale external financial assistance.

Most of these countries are due for disappointment. True, the Soviet Union—with a tremendous variety of natural resources and an iron discipline—has achieved a certain degree of autarchy; but this is no sign that many other countries—most of them much smaller—can do the same. By and large, most other countries simply lack the necessary resources. Also, to their great credit, they have a much greater concern for the freedom and aspirations of the individual. It is to be hoped that these countries will see the economic light before they add to their misery by going down the rugged path toward an autarchy that is certain to be austere.

The second international approach to the problem of resource development and conservation is through larger movements of international capital. In many countries adequate domestic capital just is not available to carry out programs which are clearly indicated as being desirable.

With adequate safeguards, the international movement of capital benefits both the recipient and the investor, because it helps to develop new resources and makes possible better utilization of



existing resources. International capital flow tends to be accompanied by managerial and technical skills and the latest technological knowledge and machinery, and for this reason may contribute to a wide sector of the economy to which it moves. Our policy is to encourage the maximum free movement of international investment capital. We ourselves know the benefits of foreign capital, for much of our early American economic development was made possible only by foreign investors. Today, most of the demands for international capital are centered on the United States, and we have made vast sums available to other countries, either as regular loans, governmental and private, as direct investments by private corporations, or as gifts.

In general, the field of development of natural resources seems to us more appropriate for private investors than for the United States Government, and we have encouraged borrowers to go to private sources of capital wherever possible. Unfortunately, many borrowers are less eager for private capital than for governmental capital, although the latter is strictly limited in amount and in approved uses. As a result of the many barriers to the entry of private capital into other countries, many countries of the world today have had and are continuing to have a much smaller flow of investment capital than they might otherwise receive. The consequence of this situation, of course, is that their resources contribute less than they are able, both because they are relatively undeveloped and because they are being wastefully developed. To repeat, we are convinced that both lender and borrower gain from a wise investment of capital, and it is our policy to encourage the flow of private investment capital both in the interest of our own lenders and in the interest of the economic development and wise resource utilization of the borrowing countries.

It is impossible to mention the potential gain from moving capital across national boundaries so that it can maximize the productivity of labor and land in other countries, without touching at least briefly on the possibilities of moving people so that they can work with existing resources. It is fairly clear that some redistribution of people could raise the productivity of workers and hence the total world product, both in the primary industries and in others. Within the United States, for example, the mobility of our labor force is

one of the great sources of our economic strength. There are, however, numerous difficulties in the way of migration in many parts of the world, although some measures have been carried out to bring workers from surplus areas to labor-shortage areas such as Canada, Australia, and Argentina.

The third and potentially most important international method of progressing toward these goals is the development, dissemination, and application of increasingly efficient technology. It is fair to say that the development of such techniques is far ahead of their application. This lag in application does not mean that we should slow up on development, but it underlines the imperative necessity of much more energetic measures to disseminate technical information on resource utilization and conservation. Much of this already takes place through private channels—through the press, the technical journals, the radio, the educational system, even the movies—and the more that can be done in this way the better. Certainly, we should help to destroy all governmental barriers not only to the free flow of news but also, so far as security considerations permit, of technical information. Capital rarely moves abroad these days without a substantial store of technical information and techniques moving with it, so our encouragement of capital flow is indirectly an encouragement to the diffusion of technical knowledge. A very interesting development of the last few years in this field has been the formation of development corporations, such as those in Latin America initiated by the Rockefeller interests, and the group working in Liberia under the aegis of former Secretary of State Edward Stettinius.

The times call for more than private communications and private capital, however, and there is widespread interest in and approval of governmental participation in the international sharing of one of our greatest resources—our knowledge of how best to utilize resources. United States Government funds in this field are administered through the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. A variety of technical missions and many interchanges of specialized personnel take place with the support of the Committee, one of whose guiding principles is the need to balance the development of physical resources with the development of human resources.

The Export-Import Bank provides engineers and technical advice in connection with the loans it extends. In addition, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs has worked out with many of our neighbors to the south a jointly supported and jointly operated device called the "Servicio", to assist in disseminating technical information and training, particularly in the health, agricultural, and educational fields. The Economic Cooperation Act provides specifically for the provision of technical and engineering assistance to participating countries in Europe. We are now experimenting with the assignment to our United States Embassies abroad of scientific attachés for the purpose of facilitating the exchange of scientific information and technology. Our Government—unlike those governments which censor not only the international transmission of information but even the expression at home of heterodox scientific opinion—our Government stands squarely behind the greatest possible development of completely objective science and technology, and its fullest possible sharing with other nations, except where security considerations prevent.

Many of the international organizations in which the United States participates have been or will be active in different phases of the dissemination of technical knowledge; for example, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the Organization of American States. The United Nations, and particularly the Economic and Social Council, are also active in this field and coordinate the work of the specialized agencies. It was the Economic and Social Council that took the initiative in calling the United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation and

Utilization of Resources, scheduled for May 16-June 3, 1949. This multilateral approach is supplemented and reinforced by the active bilateral technical assistance programs mentioned above.

Over and above the specific foreign-policy questions raised by specific resource problems is the fact that one of the fundamental purposes of our foreign policy is that the United States play an appropriate role in establishing political and economic peace in the world. In implementation of that policy, we have given our full support to the United Nations and to the specialized international agencies, including the Monetary Fund, the International Bank, and the projected International Trade Organization.

We have supplemented these efforts by concrete and material assistance to almost all countries of the world, including the Eastern European countries, in recovering from the economic dislocations of the war. We have been the leading factor in halting the advance of that totalitarian aggression that feeds on economic distress and political chaos. Currently, our major effort is the task of completing economic recovery in Europe.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that the question of whether the world's resources will be adequate in the future to provide for essential human needs is to a large extent a matter of international relations. If there is no real settlement of the political and ideological tensions with which we are now afflicted, a large part of the resources which may be available will be wasted in maintaining huge security establishments or in the supreme waste of war itself. The full development of potential resources can occur only if international conditions are such as to facilitate the interchange of technical knowledge, the flow of goods, and the transfer of capital.

## THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

### General Assembly Considers Steps for Reduction of Armaments

#### STATEMENT BY FREDERICK H. OSBORN IN COMMITTEE 1<sup>1</sup>

U.S. Delegate to the General Assembly

The resolution on disarmament before the Committee refers to the fact that "the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces can only be attained in an atmosphere of real and lasting improvement in international relations".

In my remarks today, Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss what must be done to attain, first, this "atmosphere of real and lasting improvement in international relations" which we all desire, and, second, the facts about armaments in the world today.

Mr. Chairman, there has been too little analysis of why there is an atmosphere of fear and distrust in the world today. Soviet Representatives here, like their rulers in the Kremlin, seem to us to ignore the real causes for the present tension. They pass over lightly the history of the past three years. They seem to have forgotten the shift in their policies which has taken place since we were so recently comrades-in-arms, fighting side by side in a common cause.

During the war the American people sympathized with the Russian people, as we always have sympathized with a nation attacked by an aggressor. We gave the Soviet Union every help we could, without asking any questions.

The people of Russia fought heroically to defend their country. They were told that the war was a war of defense. They were not told that the war was about Communism. But after the war Stalin's interpretation of Communism was again made a major factor in international relations. It was only after the war that Soviet leaders reconstructed the dialectic of the early days of the revolution and with equal emphasis in 1947 and 1948 stressed the inevitability of a struggle between the Soviet brand of Communism and the so-called capitalist states. Examples of their present attitude are so numerous that they might be quoted for hours on end. Let me take only a single and very recent example. The New York Times of November 5th carries an article which states the following: In the current issue

of *Bolshevik*, organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, there is an extensive article which urges that the foreign Communist Parties transform themselves into revolutionary parties dedicated to preparing the way for armed revolt. According to the author, Mr. Burdzhakov, this is a return to the original Leninist doctrine. He quoted Prime Minister Stalin as saying that the parliamentary struggle was only a school for organizing the extra-parliamentary revolutionary means of struggle. Mr. Burdzhakov added that "direction of the revolutionary activities of the masses is the basic activity of the Communists". I will not go on with the rest of the article. But it is clear that such pronouncements, in which we may include Mr. Molotov's prediction of a year ago that "all roads lead to Communism", do not create an atmosphere of confidence.

Mr. Vyshinsky himself has not allayed our anxiety. He has quoted Lenin on "capitalist encirclement" and impressed upon us that Communism is the gravedigger of our so-called capitalism. These facts make clear that the Soviet Union is once again publicly professing the aim of world revolution.

Behind the tightly sealed borders of the Soviet state almost 10 percent of the world's people are kept ignorant of what goes on in the outside world. The people of the rest of the world are disturbed at the thought of what may be going on behind this veil of secrecy. They are forced to believe, from available information, that the Soviet Union has far more men under arms than any other nation.

With this strange background of arms and secrecy, the Soviet Union since the war has done things which have been bad for international relations.

The Soviet Union has forcibly annexed territory. The Soviet Union has destroyed the hopeful progress of representative government in the countries of eastern and central Europe. The Soviet Union has obstructed the negotiations of peace treaties with Germany and Japan. The Soviet Union has refused to accept the plan of the United Nations for the control of atomic energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons which 46 other na-

<sup>1</sup> Made on Nov. 11, 1948, and released to the press on the same date. Mr. Osborn is the Deputy U.S. Representative to the Atomic Energy Commission and is on the Commission for Conventional Armaments.



tions find acceptable in principle. Soviet Representatives have cast 28 vetoes in the Security Council, many of which specifically blocked the peaceful settlement of disputes. Their summary rejection of the neutrals' plan to settle the Berlin question is fresh in our memories. There is every evidence that the Soviet Union is actively trying to prevent the reconstruction and improvement of living conditions in western Europe.

These actions force us to believe that the Soviet Union is pursuing the aim of world revolution and of destroying the economic and political systems which other peoples have chosen for themselves. Thus the Soviet Union has created a spirit of inquietude in the rest of the world. The inquietude is made worse when the Soviet Union repeats over and over things that the rest of the world knows are not true.

It is pure nonsense to say that the United States desires to attack the Soviet Union. Any person who reads history knows that the people are masters of the government they have established in the United States; and that the people want peace. They would not permit a war of aggression. We constantly hear from the Soviet Union that the American "people" do not control their government. What nonsense! Certainly after the events of the past week Mr. Vyshinsky should know beyond the shadow of a doubt that the American people choose their leaders in free, unfettered elections and that no policy can be pursued which is not supported and sanctioned by the American people.

The Russian people themselves have no such opportunities to choose their own leaders. When they do, a milestone in human progress will have been attained.

In carrying out the mandate of the people, the United States has taken very specific steps to improve world confidence and to better the chances for peace.

The United States has offered to give up the atomic bomb, to turn over all its atomic plants to an international agency, and to accept the prohibition of atomic weapons under the conditions of strict control approved by the overwhelming majority of this General Assembly.

The United States, believing that lasting peace demands healthy economic conditions, has put into effect and is cooperating with the countries of western Europe in a program of economic reconstruction and rehabilitation. This cooperative enterprise has been closed to no nation and its terms have been dictated by no nation.

The United States has exerted its efforts to strengthen the United Nations. We are fully participating in all of its agencies. By contrast, the Soviet Union has refused to participate in most of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

I am not trying to fix the blame or credit for

these things. I am only trying to place before you the facts as they appear to us in the United States and also apparently to most of the people of western Europe.

On the basis of these facts, it seems clear that we will not attain "an atmosphere of real and lasting improvement in international relations" as a prerequisite to disarmament, as required by this resolution, until the Soviet Union, not only by its words but in its actions, ceases to threaten the world with Communist aggression.

I now come to the facts about armaments. A realistic discussion of disarmament must be based on consideration of the status of the present production of armaments by the different nations as well as on their arms and armies. Let us consider first the state of arms production.

Much detail has been published in all the Western nations which shows the amounts of money now being spent on producing various types of arms for ground forces and air forces and naval forces. These sums of money are published in budgets voted by congresses or parliaments. And in the Western countries, budgets are scrutinized meticulously and frequently criticized and contested by elected representatives of the people.

The Western states, after enormous expenditures during the war, have reduced their appropriations for the production of arms and for military forces to a relatively normal peacetime figure. I am most familiar with United States statistics. At the peak of the war years, American military expenditures were more than 80 billion dollars a year. Today, three years later, and taking into account those military expenditures forced upon us by present conditions of world insecurity, the United States is spending approximately 13 billion dollars for defense purposes, or less than one sixth of the amount during a war year. Altogether, at the present time, the United States is spending approximately 6 percent of its total national income on defense.

The reduction in the number of men in our Army, Navy, and Air Force was even greater: from more than 12 million on June 30, 1945, to well less than a million and a half on December 31, 1947.

Immediately after the destruction of the Japanese and German armies, the overwhelming weight of American production, which had been concentrated on our common enemies, was turned at once to the peacetime uses of the American people. In addition, the industrial production of the American worker has provided goods and foodstuffs to help countries which had been occupied during the war, in order to restore their peacetime economies. These deliveries of goods and foodstuffs abroad were made through the contributions of the United States to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and more recently through the Marshall Plan.

Such a peaceful use of our productive capacities was a clear expression of the basic desire of the people of the United States. This desire remains unchanged. The American people want to produce for peace and not for war. But they are not ready to jeopardize their security. When during the past three years they realized that other nations remained heavily armed, indeed, appeared to be rearming, they took the steps necessary for their own protection. They began diverting some part of their production to defense. They did so with reluctance. They did so by necessity, not by choice. They realize only too well that any such decision means a corresponding reduction in the materials available for the economic and social improvement which is the road to world stability and to world security.

At the present time, 94 percent of the total national income of the United States is directed to peaceful purposes. This is the productive power which, when turned to other uses, has made the United States so powerful in two world wars. But it takes time to turn it from peaceful use into production for war. Its present use is clear evidence of our peaceful intent.

Now let us look for a moment at Soviet production of military supplies and at the Soviet armies. The Soviet Union does not follow the example of the countries of the Western world in publishing details regarding the strength of its armed services, or of monies spent on armaments. The Soviet Union does not have a congress or parliament containing an opposition free to analyze, dispute, and seek confirmation of government figures. We must therefore use the best published estimates available.

On the basis of such estimates, it appears that in the Soviet Union approximately 16 percent of the national income is now turned to munitions and the support of vast armies; which is more than double the proportion spent in the United States, or, indeed, in other Western European countries. This is a strange situation. The Russian people do not want war. The Soviet leaders do not need to convince us of that. The Russian worker, like the American worker, wants peace, security for his family, and the opportunity to improve his situation in life. We recognize that the Soviet Union has made progress in reconstruction and rehabilitation since the end of the war. In spite of the iron-clad restrictions placed on the travel of foreigners in the Soviet Union, our representatives there have seen an improvement in living conditions for Soviet citizens. But we know also that these conditions are not improving more rapidly because so much of the production of Soviet factories is going into war materials. This represents a huge drain away from peacetime improvements.

In order that the Soviet worker may accept this situation, he is kept in the fear and dread of war

by the government itself. He depends for his information upon his government-controlled and strictly censored press, radio, stage, and cinema. He hears only the news his rulers wish him to hear. It is distorted for their own purposes.

When Mr. Vyshinsky makes one of his violent speeches in a session of this General Assembly, every word he utters is printed in *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, and the newspapers throughout the vast Soviet Union. His speech of October 13 took up a large part of three successive issues of the leading Moscow papers. We have no objection to that—the verbatim texts of Mr. Vyshinsky's speeches appear in the American press. But the Soviet citizen seldom, if ever, gets the chance to read the text of a speech by a representative of a Western power. Instead he can read only brief, tendentious, distorted reports of such speeches which effectively prevent him from getting an accurate picture of our debates here. As an example of such distorted and inaccurate reporting, the Moscow papers of October 13 stated that in Ambassador Austin's speech of October 12 he had made "a whole series of slanderous statements founded on the forged documents of the Hitlerites and used early this year by the United States State Department". I need only comment in passing that not one single sentence of that speech came from a German document. Stalin's congratulatory telegram to Ribbentrop, which Mr. Vyshinsky implied was a forged document, was published at the time in the Soviet press and in Communist newspapers throughout the world, including the issue of December 28, 1939, of the *Daily Worker*.

I am sometimes gravely apprehensive, Mr. Chairman, that the Russian man-in-the-street may not be the only Soviet citizen holding a warped and twisted view of the world outside the borders of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. My misgivings arise from statements made in this committee by Mr. Vyshinsky and by recent public statements emanating from Moscow. I am led to wonder whether the rulers of the Soviet Union, the members of the Politburo themselves, may not come to believe the frightening and false propaganda picture of a world wanting to attack their country. I hope such is not the case, and I am reluctant to believe it so. I trust that the members of the Politburo, if not the Russian people, will have access to and will read carefully the verbatim records of this session of the General Assembly. If they are not then convinced of the good faith of non-Communist nations represented about this table and of the fact that these nations are not planning and will not undertake aggressive war against the Soviet Union, then I say these gentlemen are blind and impervious to the truth.

The Soviet citizen yearns for a better life. He would hope that he might live in less crowded conditions, that he might buy better clothes for his family, more books for his children, and even some



of the modern electrical appliances—toasters, irons, and refrigerators, which are beginning to appear on the shelves of Moscow department stores. The Soviet citizen would hope that the millions of political prisoners working in mines and factories might be replaced by free workers freely hired. He would hope that he might have freedom of choice in his work and place of employment.

But the Soviet Government through all its organs of publicity is telling the Soviet worker that he cannot have these things because the Western nations are threatening him with another war.

We may well ask, why does the Soviet Government tell its people things that no other people, no other nation, believes to be true? Why is it that the Soviet Government demands such a terrible sacrifice from the Russian people? Is it because the rest of the world is even more heavily armed and therefore is dangerous to the Russian people? Again, let us look at the facts as they are available.

It is our understanding from published figures which the Soviet Union has not denied, that the Soviet Union has under arms at the present time forces totaling around four million men, and its associated states another two million. Taking into account the proportion between service troops and combat troops and the size of Soviet divisions, this number would mean considerably more than 250 divisions of combat troops for the Soviet Union and the states under its control.

The Soviet states apparently have available combat troops at least five times more numerous than those of all Western European states put together. And bear in mind that it is combat troops which are the weapons of conquest and occupation. It is only the foot soldiers who can conquer, occupy, and subjugate the territory of neighbors. The rulers of the Soviet Union know this. They learned it from the Germans.

A reduction of one third would not change the disproportion in Soviet armies. So it would not relieve the anxieties of other nations. If the reduction in Soviet armies were to be carried out in secret behind the Soviet borders it would not remove from other nations the element of suspicion which is such a bar to peace.

Permit me again, Mr. Chairman, to underline one of the most fundamental points in this problem. How can we know which of the nations should reduce or have reduced their arms by one third or by one half or by three fourths without basic knowledge on which to make our decision, and without real knowledge of what goes on behind the Iron Curtain? How can we decide the relative strength of one nation vis-à-vis another, in terms of numbers of men and types of arms? We must have basic information.

The Soviet Union seems to look upon this elementary principle as an evil plot of non-Communist

states to spy out the Soviet land. The United States is built on the principle of national sovereignty and no nation asks another to do what it is not willing to do itself. Information in our countries is already available; in the Soviet Union it is not. The Soviet Representatives dare to deny the existence of the Iron Curtain. But Soviet citizens and diplomats in the United States have always been free to travel in our countries wherever and however they like; while the Soviet Union, except for three or four specified cities, is now hermetically sealed to the representatives of other governments as it is to their citizens. Even foreign diplomats are categorically prohibited from traveling beyond 50 kilometers from Moscow. They are not now allowed to set foot in eight districts within the 50 kilometer radius. They are thus literally imprisoned within the city limits of Moscow. The fact that these restrictions were imposed during this session of the General Assembly unfortunately does not testify to the present desire of the Soviet Government for cooperation and mutual understanding.

I repeat, none of us asks the Soviet Union to do more than our own governments are willing to do. But we fail to see how progress toward disarmament can be made until we all accept the basic, elementary principles of a mutual exchange and verification of information.

Let me return to consider that "improvement in international relations" which I mentioned at the beginning. How can we bring this about?

By accepting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations the Soviet Union pledged itself to cooperation for peace in the world community. Can it be that the Soviet Union, having signed the Charter, at the same time believes that war is inevitable unless some of the members of the United Nations change their systems of government?

Here then are the realities of the situation. The Soviet Union is heavily armed; it is at present kept in a position to carry on an aggressive war for the continuance of its conquest of the territory of other nations. The Soviet Union is spending a larger proportion of its manpower and its resources in preparation for war than are the Western nations. It is the Soviet Union alone that is carrying on a shrill government-directed propaganda to prepare its people for war. The Soviet Union alone is working behind a veil of secrecy. How then can the rest of the world disarm?

In this situation we meet to consider what steps might be taken by the General Assembly in the hope of bringing about a reduction of arms, and a sense of security among the peoples of the world. The Soviet proposal for a reduction of one third in the armaments of the five major powers without any verification would not bring about this result.

(Continued on page 641)



## Progress Report on Conditions of Refugees in Near East

[Released to the press November 4]

Ralph Bunche, United Nations acting mediator for Palestine, on October 18, 1948, submitted to the United Nations a progress report<sup>1</sup> on the conditions of refugees in the Near East. In his report he made reference to the statements of the late mediator, Count Bernadotte, who wrote on September 18:

The choice is between saving the lives of many thousands of people now or permitting them to die. The situation of the majority of these hapless refugees is already tragic, and to prevent them from being overwhelmed by further disaster and to make possible their ultimate rehabilitation, it is my earnest hope that the international community will give all necessary support to make the measures I have outlined fully effective. I believe that for the international community to accept its share of responsibility for the refugees of Palestine is one of the minimum conditions for the success of its efforts to bring peace to that land.

The acting mediator stated that the situation of the Palestine refugees is now critical, and the urgency of the need for assistance has been accentuated. He further stated that, unless adequate and effective aid comes quickly, the position of the refugees will become desperate within a few weeks. In his report he recalled that the figures cited in September on this situation tentatively placed the number of Arab refugees at 360,000, and the number of Jewish refugees at 7,000. He stated that the figure for Jewish refugees remains the same, but the figure for Arab refugees must be revised upwards to 472,000. The acting mediator called to the attention of the United Nations the critical shortage of food, the immediate need for clothing, and the fact that some 95,000 are without shelter of any sort.

The report of the acting mediator is borne out by numerous reports from American missions in the Near East. The refugees have been dependent upon the limited funds which they brought with them from their homes, and upon the resources of the governments in the states where they took refuge. Both of these sources are now almost completely exhausted. The situation is most critical in Palestine and Transjordan. It is estimated that 84,000 refugees in central Palestine are still without shelter, and roads are lined with people encamped

under trees or in the open. Hospital facilities are totally inadequate to meet the need; in one area of Palestine 20 suspected cases of typhoid were sent back from a nearby clinic to sleep under the trees because of the lack of hospital beds and medicines. In southwestern Syria, refugees average 20 to a fair-sized room. The infant mortality rate is high in this area, and no physician is regularly available. In many areas, preventive inoculations against diseases have not been undertaken because the limited supplies of vaccines must be reserved to fight actual outbreaks of disease.

The situation is particularly critical because the refugees include an unusually high proportion of "vulnerable" groups: it is estimated that 12 percent consist of infants; 18 percent are from 3 to 5 years of age; 36 percent are from 6 to 18 years of age; over 10 percent are pregnant women and nursing mothers; and 8 percent consist of aged, sick, and infirm people. The vulnerable total is, therefore, approximately 85 percent of the refugee population.

With a view to alleviating the increasingly critical conditions of Palestinian refugees of all communities, the United States Delegation to the General Assembly, in conjunction with the delegations of the United Kingdom, Belgium, and the Netherlands, introduced a resolution on October 29, 1948, calling for a United Nations program for the relief of Palestinian refugees. The acting mediator has estimated that a program to meet the minimum needs of these refugees until the next harvest is reaped will cost about \$30,000,000. The proposed resolution urges all Members of the United Nations to make voluntary contributions to meet this need, and calls upon the specialized agencies and voluntary organizations for supplies and personnel to assist in relieving the desperate plight of these refugees. The Department of State is deeply hopeful that the General Assembly will act speedily on this resolution.

American voluntary agencies have contributed supplies and funds for the relief of these refugees during the past few months and it is hoped that their efforts will continue to meet with success. The American Red Cross has already contributed large quantities of medical supplies and other items and has recently made a further contribution of blankets and clothing. The American Appeal for Holy Land Refugees, with headquarters at the Near East Foundation, 54 East 64th Street, New York, is continuing to mobilize American voluntary efforts.

<sup>1</sup> U.N. doc. A/689, Oct. 18, 1948, and A/689, Add. 1, Oct. 19, 1948.

## Reports of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans<sup>1</sup>

The General Assembly,

1. **HAVING CONSIDERED** the Reports by the Special Committee established by Resolution 109 (II):

2. **HAVING NOTED** the conclusions of the Special Committee and in particular its unanimous conclusion that, despite the aforesaid Resolution of the General Assembly, "the Greek guerrillas have continued to receive aid and assistance on a large scale from Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, with the knowledge of the Governments of those countries" and that the Greek guerrillas in the frontier zones have, as found by the Special Committee:

(1) "Been largely dependent on external supply. Great quantities of arms, ammunition and other military stores have come across the border, notably during times of heavy fighting. Strongly-held positions of the guerrillas have protected their vital supply lines from Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and, in particular, from Albania. In recent months, there has been less evidence of receipt of supplies from Yugoslavia by the guerrillas".

(2) "Frequently moved at will in territory across the frontier for tactical reasons, and have thus been able to concentrate their forces without interference by the Greek Army, and to return to Greece when they wished".

(3) "Frequently retired safely into the territory of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia when the Greek Army exerted great pressure".

3. **HAVING NOTED** further the conclusions of the Special Committee that a continuation of this situation "constitutes a threat to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece and to peace in the Balkans" and "that the conduct of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia has been inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations";

4. **HAVING NOTED** the recommendations submitted by the Special Committee;

5. *Considers* that the continued aid given by Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to the Greek guerrillas endangers peace in the Balkans, and is inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

6. *Calls* upon Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to cease forthwith rendering any assistance or support in any form to the guerrillas fighting against the Greek Government; including the use of their territories as a base for the preparation or launching of armed action;

7. *Again calls* upon Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to co-operate with Greece in the settlement of their disputes by peaceful means in accordance with recommendations contained in Resolution 109 (II);

8. *Calls* upon Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to co-operate with the Special Committee in enabling it to carry out its functions and upon Greece to continue to co-operate toward the same end;

9. *Recommends* to all Members of the United Nations and to all other states that their Governments refrain from any action designed to assist directly or through any other government any armed group fighting against the Greek Government;

10. *Approves* the activities of the Special Committee to date, continues it in being with the functions conferred upon it by Resolution 109 (II) and instructs it:

(a) To continue to observe and report on the response of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to the General Assembly injunction not to furnish aid to the Greek guerrillas in accordance with General Assembly Resolution 109 (II) and the present Resolution;

(b) To continue to utilize observation groups with personnel and equipment adequate for the fulfilment of its task;

(c) To continue to be available to assist the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia in the implementation of Resolution 109 (II) and of the present Resolution;

11. *Authorizes* the Special Committee to consult, in its discretion, with the Interim Committee (if it is continued) with respect to the performance of its functions in the light of developments;

12. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide the Special Committee with adequate staff and facilities to enable it to perform its functions.

## The United States in the United Nations

[November 13-19]

### Control of Armaments

The General Assembly declared on November 19 that all nations should possess "exact and authenticated" data on the arms and armed forces of other nations and that "real and lasting improvement in international relations" is required before measures for international disarmament can be safely instituted.

The world body so declared by adopting the Belgian resolution on disarmament accepted by

the great majority in the Assembly Political Committee on November 13. The vote in the General Assembly was 43 to 6 with the Soviet and other Eastern European countries opposing.

John Foster Dulles, U.S. Delegate, termed the Belgian resolution a "sound foundation for the control of armaments."

<sup>1</sup> U. N. doc A/C. 1/352, Oct. 28, 1948, draft resolution by China, France, the U.K., and the U.S.

The resolution specifies that a condition for regulation and reduction of arms and armed forces is effective atomic controls under which atomic weapons will be banned. It calls on the Security Council's Conventional Armaments Commission to develop disarmament plans to be effected when the desired improvement in international relations is brought about and atomic controls are instituted. It calls for cooperation of all members of that Commission, which comprises the Security Council membership.

Under the majority proposal, the Commission's first task would be the formulation of procedures for checking and publishing data on national armaments.

Mr. Vishinsky, the Soviet Delegate, re-echoed his statement of November 13 that the Soviet Union would submit armaments data only to an international control agency. The Soviet resolution, which was rejected by a vote of 38 to 6 on November 13 by Committee I, however, made no provision for verification. In past discussions the Soviet Union has opposed verification by an international organ of data submitted by individual governments.

The Soviet proposal also called for prohibition of atomic weapons under an international control agency within the framework of the Security Council. However, this aspect was dealt with previously when the Assembly decisively endorsed the Atomic Commission plan for an international agency with broad powers to supervise all atomic materials and facilities to insure atomic energy for peaceful uses only.

Implementation of this atomic plan has been blocked by Soviet contention that it would usurp national prerogatives and generally open the way for interference by the rest of the world, and the United States in particular, with the Soviet economy.

Speaking for the Belgian resolution on disarmament, Mr. Dulles emphasized that the first requirement "is the ability to obtain complete and accurate, verified and comprehensive" information on world armaments.

"That ability would itself create confidence and avoid the present risk that nations will create armaments in order to meet the imagined armaments of others," Mr. Dulles observed, adding: "Ignorance, fear and suspicion can breed an armaments race that will itself be provocative of war".

Referring to Soviet objections, Mr. Dulles stated:

"Some nations in the name of sovereignty refuse to accept international controls. They contend national promises and national reports ought to be an acceptable substitution for international control and international verification. The fact is national promises and unverified official reports will not serve to allay suspicion. History has too

often proved their unreliability . . . Suspicion and fear will persist unless there are effective international controls. Any nation that refuses to do what is in fact necessary to allay fear and suspicion is itself a contributor to conditions that breed war."

#### **Palestine Refugee-Aid Plan**

A \$29,500,000 relief program for the half-million Palestine war refugees was approved unanimously on November 19 by the General Assembly. The program, which is based on a proposal made by the United States, Britain, Belgium, and the Netherlands, also provides for an immediate advance of \$5,000,000 from working capital to start supplies flowing to the Near East refugee camps.

The \$29,500,000, plus an additional \$2,500,000 for administrative and operational expenses, would be raised through voluntary contributions from Member and non-Member states, and the \$5,000,000 advance is to be repaid from this total amount.

The program is to extend for nine months, ending on August 1, 1949, when the next harvest is expected to bring improved conditions.

The Assembly also authorized the Secretary-General to appoint a director for Palestine refugee relief. He is to be assisted by a seven-member advisory committee.

#### **Berlin Currency Problems**

As the President of the Security Council, Juan A. Bramuglia, pressed for a solution to the Berlin controversy by seeking to find agreement for the currency problem, U.S. Secretary of State Marshall on November 18 summoned to Paris financial and monetary experts from Washington and Berlin.

They will assist the U.S. Delegation in preparing answers to a questionnaire which President Bramuglia submitted to the Western powers and to the U.S.S.R. in his latest move to solve the impasse over Berlin. The questionnaire asks primarily for technical information on how to obtain Big Four control of the Soviet mark in Berlin.

Both Mr. Bramuglia and the Secretary-General have experts examining the currency question. The United States, hopeful that the studies will be coordinated in such manner as to avoid duplication, has expressed willingness to cooperate with either Mr. Bramuglia or Mr. Lie but has emphasized that its prime interest is in the Security Council's efforts.

As indicated in the August 30 directive agreed on at Moscow between envoys of the three Western powers and Soviet leaders, the United States always has been ready to seek a solution of the Berlin currency problem. Likewise, the United States assumes that the introduction of the Soviet



zone mark as the currency for all of Berlin under Four Power control is technically feasible.

#### **Assembly Approves Permanent Headquarters Report**

In a plenary meeting, the General Assembly on November 18 unanimously approved Secretary-General Lie's report on establishing permanent headquarters in New York City and noted with satisfaction the United States agreement to lend the international organization \$65,000,000 for building.

#### **Interim Committee**

The United States on November 17 called for continuation of the Interim Committee for another experimental year and urged all members, including the Soviet bloc, to cooperate in the body's work.

The Interim Committee, set up to expedite and maintain continuity of Assembly work between regular Assembly sessions, has concerned itself mostly during the past year with study of the veto problem and advising the Korean Commission.

Great Britain, India, the Dominican Republic, and Ecuador were among others supporting continuation of the Interim Committee and calling for participation by all members. Poland, however, reiterated its opposition.

Discussion of the Interim Committee's future was the first item on the agenda of the new *ad hoc* committee which was created to relieve the Political Committee of some of its work. On November 20 the Committee voted 44 to 6 to extend the Interim Committee for another year.

#### **Palestine Armistice Proposal**

The Security Council on November 16 called on Israel and the Arab States to draw up an armistice covering all parts of Palestine. It adopted paragraph by paragraph a Canadian-sponsored resolution directing the warring parties to negotiate directly or through United Nations acting mediator, Ralph Bunche, regarding the establishment of demarcation lines and withdrawal or reduction of armed forces to insure maintenance of the armistice pending permanent settlement in Palestine.

Eight of the Security Council's member nations voted for the armistice order, with Syria opposing the operative part and the U.S.S.R. and the Ukraine abstaining. The Council rejected a Syrian amendment aimed at extending to Galilee, in northern Palestine, a previous order for withdrawal of Israeli forces in the Negev desert area. Only Syria, China, and Belgium supported this plan.

The armistice directive was approved after a Soviet resolution which would have called for immediate establishment of formal peace in Palestine was rejected.

Philip Jessup, United States Deputy Represent-

ative, termed the Soviet measure not yet practicable; however, he supported the armistice resolution, terming it the first transitional step from a truce to permanent peace.

#### **Committee I Rejects Invitation to North Korea Delegates**

An attempt by the Soviet and Eastern European countries in Committee I (Political and Security) to have representatives of the so-called North Korean Peoples Government invited to participate in forthcoming discussion of the Korean question was rejected on November 15 by a vote of 38-0, with six abstentions.

The Committee supported the contention of the U.S. Delegate, John Foster Dulles, that the U.N. Temporary Commission on Korea, as a kind of "credentials Committee", should be heard first. Mr. Dulles also reminded committee members that the U.N. Commission had been denied entrance to the northern, or Soviet zone of Korea, where the "Peoples Government" was established through "elections" which the Commission was not permitted to observe.

A nine-member delegation from the Republic of Korea whose capital is at Seoul in South Korea has made a formal request to participate in Committee and Assembly discussions of the Korean question.

#### **Balkan States Discuss Greek Dispute**

Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Greece in Paris held their first joint discussions with U.N. mediators on November 15 in an effort to settle the Balkan dispute through direct negotiation.

After having met separately with the U.N. officials on November 12, representatives of Greece and her three northern neighbors met collectively with the mediators for the first time. Officials serving as mediators were Herbert Evatt, President of the General Assembly, Secretary-General Trygve Lie, and Selim Sarper of Turkey, Rapporteur of Committee I.

#### **Trusteeship**

The Assembly acted on November 18 on several resolutions relating to trusteeship of dependent areas. Two that were approved call on administering powers to accelerate progressive development toward self-government or independence of the trust territories under them. Another urges nations to increase the expenditure for education of the inhabitants of territories for which they are responsible and to provide free primary schooling for all. A fourth recommends that the Trusteeship Council investigate every aspect of the question of administrative unions between trust territories and adjacent political entities and suggest any safeguards it deems necessary to preserve the "distinct political status" of trust territories.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

### U.S. Delegations to International Meetings

#### ILO: Petroleum

The Department of State announced on November 9 that the following are representing the United States at the Second Session of the Petroleum Committee of the International Labor Organization (ILO) which opened on November 9 at Geneva for a period of approximately ten days.

##### GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

###### *Delegates*

Arnold L. Zempel, Associate Director, Office of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor  
David E. Longanecker, Assistant Chief, Petroleum Division, Department of State

###### *Alternate Delegate and Adviser*

Robert E. Friedman, Associate Director, Oil and Gas Division, Department of the Interior

###### *Adviser*

Hersey E. Riley, Chief, Branch of Construction Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor

##### EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATIVES

###### *Delegates*

John C. Quilty, Manager of Industrial Relations, Shell Oil Company, Inc., New York City  
C. Francis Beatty, Director, Socony-Vacuum Oil Company, Inc., New York City

###### *Advisers*

Channing Rice Dooley, Training Within Industry Foundation, Summit, N.J.  
Valentine H. Ludwig, General Manager, Employee Relations Department, Gulf Oil Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
James W. Rees, Assistant Vice President, Pure Oil Company, Chicago, Ill.  
R. B. Roaper, Director of Safety, Humble Oil and Refining Company, Houston, Tex.

##### WORKERS' REPRESENTATIVES

###### *Delegates*

Charles A. Evans, Business Representative of Local Union No. 12, International Union of Operating Engineers, Los Angeles, Calif.  
Alexis E. Laster, International Representative, International Union of Operating Engineers, El Monte, Calif.

The agenda for the meeting includes: (1) a general report dealing with the action taken in the various countries to give effect to the resolutions of the first session of the Committee, held at Los Angeles in February 1947, and recent events

and developments in the industry; (2) discussion of recruitment and training for the petroleum industry; (3) report on safety and health; and (4) the problem of industrial relations in the industry as effecting trade-union organization and recognition, developments in collective bargaining, and actual methods for handling disputes.

The Petroleum Committee is one of eight industrial committees of the ILO established for the purpose of examining social and economic aspects of international labor standards in the respective industries and adopting resolutions for their improvement.

#### British Parliamentary Association

[Released to the press November 12]

United States congressional representatives to the British Parliamentary Association meeting which convened at Hamilton, Bermuda, on November 15 left Washington on November 13.

The chairman of the United States Delegation is Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin. Also included are Senators Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa and Elbert D. Thomas of Utah, all members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas. The chairman of the House Delegation is Representative Henry O. Talle of Iowa, the remainder including Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, Senator-elect from that state, and Robert J. Corbett of Pennsylvania. In Bermuda they were met by heads of the Bermuda Government and United States consular officials on duty there.

This is the third such parliamentary conference attended by representatives from all the British Commonwealth Parliaments and delegates from the United States Congress which has been held in the Western Hemisphere. The first meeting took place during the war in Ottawa, Canada, and another conference was held again two years ago in Hamilton, Bermuda.

Heading up the list of British Delegates are John Wilmot, M.P., former Minister of Supply from the United Kingdom, Senator J. T. Haig, K.C., leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in the Canadian Senate, and Vernon H. Treatt, K.C., leader of the Opposition in New South Wales, Australia. Delegates are also in attendance from New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and Bermuda.

## Air Navigation in Southeast Asia

The Department of State announced on November 10 the United States Delegation to the first International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Regional Air Navigation Meeting for the Southeast Asia Region, convening at New Delhi, India, November 23, 1948, for an approximate duration of three weeks.

### Chairman

Clifford P. Burton, Chief of the Technical Mission, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce

### Vice Chairman

Oscar Bakke, Flight Operations Specialist, Civil Aeronautics Board

### Alternates

James F. Angier, Chief of the Foreign Section, Civil Aeronautics Administration  
 Norman R. Hagen, Meteorological Attaché, American Embassy, London  
 Victor J. Kayne, Airways Operations Specialist (ICAO), Civil Aeronautics Administration  
 R. F. Nicholson, Representative, Flight Operations (ICAO), Civil Aeronautics Administration  
 Lt. Comdr. Clement Vaughn, Jr., Search and Rescue Agency, United States Coast Guard  
 Edwin L. White, Chief, Aviation Division, Federal Communications Commission

### Advisers

William B. Becker, Operations Division, Air Transport Association  
 Gene L. Brewer, Airways Radio Specialist (ICAO), Civil Aeronautics Administration  
 Capt. Etheridge Grant, USN, Head, Civil Aviation Branch, Department of the Navy  
 Maj. Grove C. Johnson, Civil Liaison Branch, Hq., Military Air Transport Service, Department of the Air Force  
 Winton E. Modin, representing Aeronautical Radio, Inc., and Pan American Airways, Calcutta, India  
 George L. Rand, airways operations specialist, representative for International Telecommunications—ICAO regional organizations, Civil Aeronautics Administration  
 Capt. Arthur Yorra, Chief, International and Interdepartmental Advisory Group, Hq., Air Weather Service, MATS, Department of the Air Force

### Secretary of Delegation

Stephen V. C. Morris, Division of International Conferences, Department of State

About 20 governments are attending this meeting which is examining problems of air navigation and operations in the Southeast Asian region. The delegates are preparing a plan of aids to navigation and are recommending navigation practices to raise the standards of civil aviation in the region to those advocated by the ICAO Council. The meeting is following the usual pattern of regional meetings of the ICAO and the principal committees formed include aerodromes, air routes and ground aids, air-traffic control, flight operations, communications, meteorology, and search and rescue. The practices and procedures recommended by the meeting in these fields are being forwarded to the

Council of ICAO at Montreal for consideration and approval.

A Fact Finding Group convened at New Delhi approximately a week prior to the regional meeting in order to examine and document operational data for the convenience and use of the main meeting.

The Southeast Asia meeting is the ninth in the original series of ten regional meetings scheduled by ICAO to survey aviation facilities throughout the world. Upon the completion of the series ICAO expects to have an index of facilities needed by international civil aviation on all the important air routes of the world.

The preceding regional meeting, the North Pacific Air Navigation Meeting, was held at Seattle in July. The remaining regional meeting projected by the ICAO is the African-Indian Ocean Meeting.

## Fourth Session of FAO

The President appointed on November 13 Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, as United States Member and Chairman of the United States Delegation to the Fourth Session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This meeting opened in Washington, D.C., on November 15, 1948. Named by the President to serve as Alternate United States Members were: Albert J. Loveland, Under Secretary of Agriculture; Fred J. Rossiter, Associated Director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture; and Edward G. Cale, Associate Chief, International Resources Division, Department of State.

The President appointed also the following five congressional advisers to the Delegation: George D. Aiken, United States Senate; Elmer Thomas, United States Senate; S. Otis Bland, House of Representatives; Harold D. Cooley, House of Representatives; and Clifford R. Hope, House of Representatives.

Other members of the United States Delegation as announced on November 13 by the Acting Secretary of State are as follows:

### Advisers

Edward W. Allen, United States Commissioner, International Fisheries Commission and International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission  
 Andrew W. Anderson, Chief, Branch of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior  
 Stanley Andrews, Food Agriculture and Forestry Representative, OMCS  
 Miss Persia Campbell, Vice Chairman, National Association of Consumers  
 Wilbert M. Chapman, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary, Department of State  
 Philip V. Cardon, Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration, Department of Agriculture  
 Charles R. Carry, Director, Fishery Products Division, National Canners Association

November 21, 1948



## ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

John H. Davis, Executive Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives  
Mrs. Ursula Duffus, Economic, Financial and Communications Branch, Division of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State  
Foster F. Elliott, Associate Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture  
Carl N. Gibboney, Deputy Director, Commodities Division, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce  
Tom H. Gill, Society of American Foresters  
Albert S. Goss, Master, The National Grange  
George Mason Ingram, Acting Chief, International Administration Staff, Office of United Nations Affairs, Department of State  
Charles E. Jackson, General Manager, National Fisheries Institute  
William A. Jump, Director, Office of Budget and Finance, Department of Agriculture  
William A. Minor, Jr., Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Agriculture  
Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior  
W. Raymond Ogg, Director, Department of International Affairs, American Farm Bureau Federation  
James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union  
Miss Hazel K. Stiebeling, Chief, Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Department of Agriculture  
Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture  
Lyle F. Watts, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture  
Oris V. Wells, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture  
Miss Faith M. Williams, Director, Office of Foreign Labor Conditions, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor  
Milburn L. Wilson, Director, Extension Service, Department of Agriculture

### Technical Secretary

James O. Howard, Head, Division of Foreign Agricultural Information, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture

### Executive Secretary

Henry F. Nichol, Division of International Conferences, Department of State

Since the first three sessions of the Conference were devoted primarily to problems of organization, the Fourth Session should mark an important step in the direction of devoting these annual meetings to discussion on world food problems and to specific proposals to deal with these problems.

It is expected that 57 member countries and a number of international organizations will be represented at the Fourth Session. Also a number of national organizations have been invited to attend open sessions of the Conference.

The meeting is concerned mainly with: (1) the world situation relating to the production, marketing, and consumption of food and agricultural products, including fish and timber; (2) the technical activities of the Organization during the past year and its program of work for 1949; and (3) major constitutional, administrative, and financial issues requiring decision by the Conference, including financial problems and the permanent site of Fao headquarters.

In regard to the headquarters site, the United States Government has recommended Washington as the permanent headquarters for the Organization and has made proposals concerning several available sites. President H. C. Byrd of the University of Maryland, after consultation with Governor William P. Lane, Jr., of Maryland, has offered a site and assistance in financing a building on the campus. Copenhagen and Rome have also made offers.

### UNESCO: General Conference:

President Truman designated on November 10 five United States Representatives and five alternates to the Third Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which convened at Beirut, Lebanon, on November 17.

#### United States Representatives

George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for public affairs, and Chairman of the Delegation  
Milton S. Eisenhower, President, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., and Vice Chairman of the Delegation  
Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress  
Waldo G. Leland, Director Emeritus, American Council of Learned Societies  
Anne O'Hare McCormick, *New York Times*

#### Alternates

Kathleen Lardie, Division of Instruction of the Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, Mich.  
W. Albert Noyes, Jr., National Research Council, Washington, D. C.  
Frederick D. G. Ribble, Dean, School of Law, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.  
Joseph Rosier, President Emeritus, Fairmont State Teachers College, Fairmont, W. Va.  
George F. Zook, President, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.

#### Special Adviser to the Chairman

Charles A. Thomson, Director, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State

#### Advisers

Herbert J. Abraham, Assistant Director, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State  
Esther C. Brunauer, Assistant Director, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State  
Ben M. Cherrington, Director, Social Science Foundation, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.  
John Duffy Connors, Director, Workers Education Bureau of America, New York, N. Y.  
Samuel De Palma, Division of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State  
Frederick Sherwood Dunn, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.  
Frank Grasso, Secretary-Treasurer, United Paperworkers of America, Washington, D.C.  
Michael Richard Hanna, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.  
George Kenneth Holland, Counselor on UNESCO Affairs, American Embassy, Paris  
Charles M. Hulten, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of State  
Kendric N. Marshall, Director, Division of International Educational Relations, United States Office of Education  
Richard P. McKeon, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
Otis E. Mulliken, Division of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State

Stephen B. L. Penrose, President, American University, Beirut, Lebanon  
 George D. Stoddard, President, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.  
 Louise Wright, Director, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill.

*Executive Secretary of the Delegation*

Henry J. Sabatini, Division of International Conferences, Department of State

In accordance with the UNESCO constitution, the Executive Board of UNESCO, at its meeting at Paris last February, prepared the draft agenda for the Third Session of the General Conference. Among the items on the agenda are: (1) report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization in 1948; (2) consideration of reports submitted by member states in 1948; (3) discussion of certain items in the program for 1948 and of new activities proposed for 1949; (4) the Organization's budget; (5) matters which have been raised by member states, the United Nations, or other specialized agencies; (6) organizational questions including the National Commissions of UNESCO; (7) election of seven members to the Executive Board; (8) appointment of the Director-General; (9) consideration of recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of new members to the Organization; and (10) consideration of recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of observers of international nongovernmental organizations to the Third Session of the General Conference.

The First Session of the UNESCO Conference was held at Paris in 1946, and the Second at Mexico City in 1947. Forty-four member countries are expected to send representatives to the Third Session.

UNESCO's Executive Board, on which George D. Stoddard is United States Representative, will meet at Istanbul prior to the opening of the Beirut conference.

The UNESCO program in the United States is largely the responsibility of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, established by law to advise the Department of State on matters relating to UNESCO. Milton S. Eisenhower is chairman of the National Commission, which is composed of representatives of 60 national organizations and some 40 members selected as individuals active in UNESCO's fields of education, science, and culture.

**Second Inter-American Congress on Brucellosis**

Dr. James H. Steele, Chief of the Veterinary Public Health Section, States Relations Division of the United States Public Health Service, was appointed on November 12 Chairman of the United States Delegation to the Second Inter-American Congress on Brucellosis, held at Mendoza and Buenos Aires November 17-26, 1948. Dr. C. K. Mingle of the Tuberculosis Eradication Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry,

Department of Agriculture, was named delegate.

The Brucellosis Congress, called by the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, is discussing the epidemiology of the disease and proposes measures for its control. Brucellosis, as it affects humans, is popularly known as "undulant fever" and "Malta fever". It is transmitted to human beings through animals. According to the Department of Agriculture, the disease among animals results in monetary losses of approximately 90 million dollars a year in this country. It has been even more widespread in some of the Latin American countries.

The Congress meets first at Mendoza from November 17-20 for discussions on the control of the disease; it reconvenes at Buenos Aires from November 22-26 for sessions on the clinical aspects and research developments. The First Inter-American Congress on Brucellosis was held in October 1946 at Mexico City.

**Reduction of Armaments—Continued from page 633**

It would perpetuate the present Soviet superiority in aggressive forces. It would not reduce the threat of Soviet aggression; it might indeed increase that threat. It would not raise the veil of secrecy behind which the rulers of the Soviet Union operate and which constitutes such an injustice to the Russian people and such a cause of suspicion among nations.

In this situation the General Assembly should seek by every possible means a release from the tensions arising from the factors we have here described. In the field of armaments the General Assembly should develop as rapidly as possible under the forms and through the agencies set up in the United Nations for that purpose a plan for the reduction and control of conventional arms and armaments. Such a plan should provide a full system of inspection, verification, and publication and other safeguards to guarantee against violation. Having set up such a plan, we may hope that the moral force of world opinion, together with the evident advantages of operating within the law in cooperation with other nations, may bring the Soviet Union to change its attitude. This is the proposal embodied in the resolution now before this committee. The United States will vote for this resolution and will work loyally toward carrying out its purposes.

Real progress toward peace can only be made by slow, careful steps. I have not despaired and I hope none of us in this committee has despaired. The resolution before us takes us one step toward the control of armaments and toward those other objectives we all seek. I hope that the unanimity which came as a breath of fresh air when we accepted the Mexican resolution, will again come to us here.



## THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

### Announcement of Intention To Enter Tariff Negotiations

The Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee issued on November 5 formal notice of the United States intention to participate in negotiations with 11 foreign countries for reciprocal reduction of tariff and other trade barriers, looking toward accession of those countries to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade concluded at Geneva on October 30, 1947, by the United States and 22 other countries. The forthcoming negotiations are scheduled to begin at Geneva on April 11, 1949. Plans for the negotiations were developed, and the date was set, at the second session of the contracting parties to the General Agreement, held at Geneva in August and September of this year. Announcement of these plans was made on September 22, 1948.<sup>1</sup>

The 11 countries which have expressed their desire to accede to the General Agreement and to participate in the forthcoming negotiations are: Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Nicaragua, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay. The countries which participated in the 1947 negotiations were: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Southern Rhodesia, Syria, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. All of these countries except Chile had put the General Agreement into provisional effect by July 31, 1948.

The countries participating in the 1947 negotiations and the additional countries expected to participate in the 1949 negotiations together account for some two thirds by value of total United States exports and almost three fourths of United States imports, on the basis of 1947 figures.

The Trade Agreements Committee also made public on November 5, as required by Executive Order No. 10,004 of October 5, 1948, a list for each country with which the United States proposes to negotiate, of all products imported into the United States on which possible tariff concessions may be considered in the negotiations. The practice of publishing such lists has been followed since 1937.

The procedure to be followed by the United States Government in preparing for and carrying out the negotiations is in line with that which has been followed in previous trade-agreement negotiations, with such modifications as are made necessary by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of

1948. Under section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, interested persons are afforded an opportunity to present their views concerning the proposed negotiations. Executive Order 10,004 designated the Committee for Reciprocity Information as the agency to receive such views. The representative of the Department of Commerce on the Trade Agreements Committee is the chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information announced November 5 that public hearings will be held beginning December 7. Applications to be heard at the public hearings will be received until November 29, and the application must indicate the product or products, or other aspect of the negotiations, regarding which testimony is to be presented. The closing date for receiving written briefs and statements will be December 7.

In accordance with the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 the lists of products on which possible United States tariff concessions may be considered have been transmitted by the President to the Tariff Commission which is required to investigate, hold hearings, and report to him within 120 days, in regard to each such item, (1) the extent to which United States tariffs or other import restrictions may be reduced without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles; and (2) what, if any, additional import restrictions would be required to prevent such injury.

Since the statute specifically imposes on the Tariff Commission the obligation of holding its own hearings, parties who wish to be assured that their information will be considered by the Tariff Commission, must present it directly to the Commission either at the hearings or in writing before the close of the hearings.

In order to minimize duplication, arrangements have been made so that information submitted to the Tariff Commission in written statements and at public hearings, in accordance with its rules of practice and procedure, other than that which has been accepted by the Commission as confidential, will be made available to the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Thus, persons wishing to testify only with respect to articles on the public lists may, but need not, appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. However, those persons wishing to present information concerning possible import concessions different

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Oct. 3, 1948, p. 445.



from that presented to the Tariff Commission or wishing to present views with respect to export concessions to be obtained by the United States should present their information to the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

The hearings to be held by the Tariff Commission and those to be held by the Committee for Reciprocity Information will run concurrently, but the hearings relative to particular commodities will be scheduled so as to avoid conflict in cases of persons wishing to appear at both hearings.

No United States tariff concession will be made on any import product not appearing on the lists made public November 5 unless it is subsequently included in a supplementary published list. Inclusion of a given product on such a published list does not necessarily mean that a concession is to be made on that product. Recommendations by the Trade Agreements Committee to the President on concessions to be offered will not be made until after the information received through the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Tariff Commission has been studied, together with all other data available to the trade-agreements organization. Concessions actually made will, of course, depend on the outcome of the negotiations.

The lists of possible concession products made public November 5 are based upon the language of the Tariff Act of 1930. The published lists do not include the rates of duty now in effect on the items

enumerated. Those rates are shown in *United States Import Duties (1948)* and Supplement 1 thereto, published by the Tariff Commission. Copies of these documents and of the published lists of possible concession products may be obtained at the Tariff Commission, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and from the district and regional offices of the Department of Commerce.

Each new country which completes tariff negotiations with existing contracting parties will accede, in its own right, to the concessions negotiated by those contracting parties in 1947. Furthermore, each new acceding country must extend to all other countries with which it has completed tariff negotiations, in their own right, all concessions which it negotiates in the forthcoming meeting. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that such extension of previously negotiated concessions is a bargaining factor in the forthcoming negotiations.

The General Agreement includes the so-called escape clause, required by executive order, which permits the United States to modify or withdraw a concession if it is found that, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession, imports are entering this country in such increased amounts and under such circumstances as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar products.

### Procedure To Be Followed by the United States

#### Committee for Reciprocity Information

*Trade-Agreement Negotiations with Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Nicaragua, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay; possible adjustments in preferential rates on Cuban products*

#### SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Closing date for application to be heard, November 29, 1948.

Public hearings open, December 7, 1948.

Closing date for submission of briefs, December 7, 1948.

The Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements has issued on this day a notice of intention to conduct trade-agreement negotiations with each of the following countries: Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Nicaragua, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay. Annexed to this public notice are lists of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible concessions in the negotiations with each of the above countries.

It is stated by the Trade Agreements Committee

that it is proposed to enter into these negotiations with a view to the accession of the countries named above as contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Trade Agreements Committee has also announced in such notice that, in the case of an article in one or more of these lists with respect to which the corresponding product of Cuba is now entitled to preferential treatment, a modification of the rate in the negotiations referred to will involve the elimination, reduction, or continuation of the preference, perhaps in some cases with an adjustment or specification of the rate applicable to the product of Cuba.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information hereby gives notice that information and views in writing in regard to the foregoing proposals with respect to any of the named countries (including areas for which any of these countries has authority to conduct trade-agreement negotiations) shall be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information not later than 12:00 noon, December 7, 1948, and all applications for oral presentation of views in regard thereto, including a statement as to the import product or products, if any, on which the applicant wishes to be heard, shall be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Infor-

November 21, 1948

mation not later than 12:00 noon, November 29, 1948.

Such communications shall be addressed to "The Chairman, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D. C." Ten copies of written statements, either typewritten or printed, shall be submitted, of which one copy shall be sworn to.

Public hearings will be held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, at which oral statements will be heard. The first hearing will be at 10:00 a. m. on December 7, 1948, in the auditorium of Department of Commerce Building at 14th and E Streets, N. W., Washington, D. C. Witnesses who make application to be heard will be advised regarding the time and place of their individual appearances. Appearances at hearings before the Committee may be made by or on behalf of those persons who have within the time prescribed made written application for oral presentation of views. Statements made at the public hearings shall be under oath.

Persons or groups interested in import products may present to the Committee their views concerning possible tariff concessions by the United States on any product, whether or not included in any of the lists annexed to the notice of intention to negotiate which has been issued by the Trade Agreements Committee, and concerning any other matters relating to the proposed negotiations. Copies of these lists may be obtained from the Committee for Reciprocity Information at the address designated above and may be inspected at the field offices of the Department of Commerce. As indicated in the notice of intention to negotiate, no tariff concession will be considered on any product which is not included in a list annexed thereto unless it is subsequently included in a supplementary public list.

Persons or groups interested in export products may present their views regarding any tariff or other concessions that might be requested of any of the foreign governments with which it is proposed to undertake trade-agreement negotiations.

A written statement submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information may relate to articles contained in one or more of such lists or to other matters relating to the proposed trade-agreement negotiations with one or more of the countries listed above, and oral statements may also relate to one or more such lists or negotiations, subject to any scheduling that may be made by the Committee in advising as to the time and place of individual appearances.

By direction of the Committee for Reciprocity Information this 5th day of November 1948.

EDWARD YARDLEY  
Secretary, Committee for  
Reciprocity Information

November 5, 1948

#### Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements

*Trade-agreement negotiations with Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Nicaragua, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay; possible adjustments in preferential rates on Cuban products*

Pursuant to section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act approved June 12, 1934 (48 Stat. (pt. 1) 945, ch. 474) as extended and amended by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 (Pub. Law 792—80th Cong.) and to paragraph 4 of Executive Order 10004 of October 5, 1948 (13 F. R. 5853), notice is hereby given by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements of intention to conduct trade-agreement negotiations with each of the following countries, including in each case areas in respect of which the country has authority to conduct trade-agreement negotiations: Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Nicaragua, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay. It is proposed to enter into negotiations with these countries with a view to their accession as contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

There is annexed hereto a list<sup>2</sup> of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment in the proposed trade-agreement negotiations with each of the above countries, each of which lists has been approved by the President and transmitted to the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to paragraph 4 of Executive Order 10004. In the case of an article in one or more of these lists with respect to which the corresponding product of Cuba is now entitled to preferential treatment, a modification of the rate in the negotiations referred to will involve the elimination, reduction, or continuation of the preference, perhaps in some cases with an adjustment or specification of the rate applicable to the product of Cuba.

No tariff concession will be considered in the negotiations with any country on any article which is not included in the annexed list relative to such country unless it is subsequently included in a supplementary public list approved by the President and transmitted to the Tariff Commission. No duty or import tax imposed under a paragraph or section of the Tariff Act or Internal Revenue Code other than the tariff paragraph listed with respect to such article will be considered for a possible decrease, although an additional or separate duty on an article included in an annexed list, which is imposed under a paragraph or section other than that listed, may be bound against increase as an assurance that the concession under the listed paragraph or section will not be nullified.

<sup>2</sup> Not printed.

Pursuant to section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, information and views as to the matters specified in that section may be submitted to the United States Tariff Commission in accordance with the announcement of this date issued by the Commission. Pursuant to section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, as amended, and paragraph 6 of Executive Order 10004 of October 5, 1948, information and views as to any aspect of the proposals announced in this notice may be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in accordance with the announcement of this date issued by that Committee. Arrangements are being made to coordinate the hearings to be held by the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information in order to facilitate the

convenience of persons desiring to appear at both hearings. Information and views submitted to the Tariff Commission, except those accepted by the Commission as confidential, will be made available to the Committee for Reciprocity Information although, on account of the statutory requirement as to the investigation by the Tariff Commission, persons and groups who wish to be assured that their information and views will be considered by the Tariff Commission should present them directly to the Commission.

By direction of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements this 5th day of November 1948.

WOODBURY WILLOUGHBY  
Chairman, Interdepartmental  
Committee on Trade Agreements

## U.S. Interest in Revival of Japanese Economy on Peaceful Self-Supporting Basis

STATEMENT BY MAJOR GENERAL FRANK R. McCOY<sup>1</sup>

U.S. Representative on the Far Eastern Commission

I have noted the various statements on the subject of FEC-320 made by the Soviet Ambassador before the Far Eastern Commission.<sup>2</sup> I have also noted his statement released to the press on September 24. In the light of the resolution by the Soviet Representative and the ensuing discussions in the Commission, it appears to me desirable at this juncture to state the views of my Government on this matter.

As will be recalled, the Allies and the Far Eastern Commission have on several occasions announced policies dealing with primary and secondary war facilities and, in principle, war-supporting industries. Insofar as the peaceful economy of Japan is concerned, the United States, you will recall, has never expressed the view that restrictions should be placed on peaceful Japanese production. On the contrary, the United States has repeatedly advocated measures which would have the effect of stimulating the early revival of the peaceful Japanese economy. For example, it will be recalled that the basic position of my Government on this matter was summarized as far back as January 21 of this year when I said to this Commission:

"My Government believes that the Japanese Government and people, the Far Eastern Commis-

sion and its member states, and the Supreme Commander . . . should take all possible and necessary steps, consistent with the basic policies of the occupation, to bring about the early revival of the Japanese economy on a peaceful self-supporting basis."

It would be highly inconsistent for my Government to take any other view when at the same time it is pursuing in other parts of the world programs designed primarily to alleviate suffering and to bring about economic revival. We are making great efforts to contribute, in cooperation with other nations, to the raising of economic well-being and to bring about economic revival wherever possible.

Accordingly, we welcome that part of the statement of the Soviet Representative which draws attention to the need for an early Japanese revival and which indicates support for the policies of the United States Government.

The second Soviet proposal, as explained by the Soviet Representative, calls for the establishment and exercise of international controls over war

<sup>1</sup> Made on Nov. 11, 1948, at the meeting of the Commission and released to the press on the same date.

<sup>2</sup> Not printed.



industries in Japan after the treaty of peace comes into effect. Determination of post-treaty arrangements, as the Commission is aware, falls outside its terms of reference. I am certain that you are fully aware how thoroughly the demilitarization of Japan has been carried out. It should be unnecessary to reiterate that the United States is determined that Japan shall not again be able to undertake aggression.

In conclusion it is the view of my Government that the Soviet resolution would serve no useful purpose, would in substance only reiterate Far Eastern Commission and Allied policy decisions of long standing, and would in part be beyond the acceptance of the Far Eastern Commission.

### Procedure for Filing War Claims in U.S. Zone of Germany

[Released to the press November 12]

The Department of State refers to the Joint State-Army announcement of November 10, 1947,<sup>1</sup> regarding the promulgation of Military Government law no. 59, an internal restitution law providing for the restitution of identifiable property located in the U.S.-occupied zone of Germany (excluding U.S. sector of Berlin) which was taken from its rightful owners by the Nazis during the period from January 30, 1933, to May 8, 1945, through transactions under duress arising from discrimination because of race, religion, nationality, ideology, and political opposition to National Socialism.

All claims under the law must be filed on or before December 31, 1948. The Office of Military Government for Germany (U.S.) has informed the Department of State that no extension of the filing period provided for in Military Government law no. 59 has been authorized or is anticipated. Claimants are not precluded from filing claims before the deadline by reason of lack of complete information, since article 58 of this law provides that the period of limitation shall be deemed to have been complied with by filing a written statement with—

Zentralanmeldeamt (Central Filing Agency)  
Bad Nauheim, Germany

Such a statement need not be under oath but should contain a description of confiscated property, stating as exactly as possible, the time, place, and circumstances of the confiscation; and in addition, so far as is known to the claimant, the names and addresses of all persons having or claiming to have an interest in the property.

Claims should not be sent to the Department of State, to Military Government offices, or to local German government officials.

<sup>1</sup> Not printed. Refer to BULLETIN of Feb. 8, 1948, p. 185.

### Murder of Irving Ross in Austria Under Investigation

[Released to the press November 11]

The Department has received a preliminary report from the American Legation at Vienna concerning the murder of Irving Ross, Assistant to the Economic Cooperation Administrator for Austria.

The information in the report is limited to the fragmentary account given Austrian police by Miss Dana Sopevina, who was with Mr. Ross at the time of the attack. Miss Sopevina, who was gravely injured and is now in an Austrian hospital in the Soviet zone of Vienna, stated that she and Mr. Ross had attended a dinner party, following which they drove another guest to his residence in the Soviet zone. On their return they were accosted in the Soviet zone by four armed men in Soviet uniform. They were forced to drive to an outlying district, where both were badly beaten. Miss Sopevina was thrown from the car. Ross' body was found by Austrian police in his car in the Soviet zone early on the morning of October 31.

Lieutenant General Geoffrey Keyes, the United States High Commissioner to Austria; Mr. John G. Erhardt, the United States Minister; and Mr. Westmore Willcox, Chief of the ECA Mission to Austria, are cooperating in a thorough investigation of the case.

### Ratification Instruments Exchanged Between U.S. and Norway

[Released to the press November 9]

Acting Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett and Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne, Norwegian Ambassador in Washington, have formally exchanged the instruments of ratification of a claims convention between the United States and Norway which was signed in Washington on March 28, 1940. The convention provides for the disposition of a claim of the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, a Norwegian subject, and a claim of the Government of the United States against the Government of Norway on behalf of the late George R. Jones, an American citizen.

The convention provides for an exchange of pleadings and evidence in relation to the two claims in the hope that by thus more clearly bringing to light the facts and the law relied upon by the two Governments in support of their respective contentions a diplomatic settlement may be possible. It is further provided that in the event that such a settlement is not reached the Hannevig

Department of State Bulletin

claim shall be submitted to the United States Court of Claims for adjudication and the Jones claim to a sole arbitrator for decision.

The convention entered into force upon the exchange of the instruments of ratification thereof.

The Hannevig claim arose by virtue of the requisitioning by the United States of ships under construction in the three partially completed Hannevig shipyards in 1917. The shipbuilding companies had been organized as American corporations by Christoffer Hannevig in 1916 and 1917. After requisitioning the partially completed ships the then United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation advanced the capital necessary to complete the financing of the shipyards. After the three companies were organized into one corporation known as the Pusey & Jones Company, relations between that corporation and the Emergency Fleet Corporation became increasingly complicated. An award was made to the Pusey & Jones Company in 1920 which the Emergency Fleet Corporation considered to be just compensation, but it was not accepted. During the ensuing litigation Hannevig was adjudged bankrupt and the Pusey & Jones Company forced into receivership. The Emergency Fleet Corporation, which had intervened in the receivership proceedings as a mortgage creditor, reached a compromise settlement in 1926 with the receivers, which was approved by the United States District Court for the District of Delaware. The Pusey & Jones Company released the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the United States from all further claims.

Hannevig's case, based upon allegations that the Pusey & Jones Company had not been paid just compensation, was brought to the attention of the Department of State by the Norwegian Government in 1926 and again in 1935. The amount of the claim was stated as approximately 68 million dollars.

The claim against Norway on behalf of the late George R. Jones is based upon losses amounting to more than \$100,000 suffered by the George R. Jones Company in connection with several shipments of shoes sent to Norway in 1920 pursuant to a contract between the company and a Norwegian purchaser. Payment for the shoes was guaranteed by a Norwegian bank. The shoes arrived in Norway at a time when prices were falling and Norwegian money was depreciating in terms of dollars. The purchaser refused to accept some of the shoes on the alleged ground that they did not conform to sample and were of inferior quality. The Norwegian bank refused to pay or to admit liability upon its guaranty. The American company brought suit against the bank in the Norwegian courts. The lower court decided in favor of the company but the Supreme Court of Norway reversed the decision. The company has taken the position that the decision of the Supreme Court of Norway constituted a denial of justice.

November 21, 1948

## Procedure for Filing Claims With Finland

[Released to the press November 8]

Reference is made to a State Department announcement of July 15, 1948, concerning claims for losses caused by transferring so-called German property in Finland to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.<sup>1</sup>

The Department is now in receipt of further information to the effect that by a decision of the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Finland dated September 24, 1948, the time limit for submitting claims for losses incurred through the transfer of German property by Finland to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has been extended to January 24, 1949, in the case of persons permanently residing abroad and to November 24, 1948, in the case of persons residing in Finland. If the loss is incurred after September 24, 1948, claims from persons residing abroad must be submitted within four months of the date of loss and claims from persons residing in Finland must be submitted within two months of the date of loss.

As stated in the Department of State announcement, claims from abroad should be filed through the Finnish Legations or Consulates, the chiefs of which are career officers. The offices in the United States which may receive claims are the Legation of Finland, 2144 Wyoming Avenue, Washington, D. C., and the Finnish Consulate General, 53 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

It is suggested that American claimants inform the Department of any claims which they may file under the above procedure.

## International Commission for Scientific Investigation of Tuna Recommended

The Department of State announced on November 9 the result of the discussions between officials of Mexico and of the United States on fishery-conservation matters of common concern. The discussions, which commenced October 25 in Mexico City, were concluded on November 4 with the signing by both delegations of a joint report to the two governments in which it was recommended that there be concluded a convention for the establishment of an international commission for the scientific investigation of tuna.

The joint report of the meeting, which contains the text of the proposed convention, is included in Department of State press release 896 of November 9. The report urges the governments to establish a joint commission for the investigation of the tuna resources of the Pacific Ocean with a

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Aug. 1, 1948, p. 148.



view to maintaining the resource at a level which will assure a reasonable maximum utilization, year after year, without depletion. The report concludes that such convention would result in positive benefit to the fishing industries of both countries and would contribute to conservation of food resources.

## Visas Not Required for Americans on Temporary Visits to U.K.

[Released to the press November 12]

Effective November 12, 1948, American citizens in possession of valid American passports may enter the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland without British visas for a temporary period of stay provided they comply with other laws and regulations of the United Kingdom concerning the entry, residence, and employment or occupation of foreigners or travelers.

Statutory and other restrictions preclude the United States from granting full reciprocity, but British subjects resident in the United Kingdom in possession of valid British passports who are eligible to enter the United States as *bona fide* non-immigrants will be granted effective November 12, 1948, gratis passport visas, and in cases of qualified temporary visitors, visas may be valid for 24 months provided the passports of the bearers remain valid for that period of time. All other nonimmigrant passport visas granted British subjects resident in the United Kingdom will, as at present, have a maximum period of validity of 12 months provided the passports remain valid for that period of time.

This arrangement will be put into effect outside the United Kingdom for British subjects residing therein but who are temporarily absent therefrom and who are proceeding to the United States as nonimmigrants, as soon as American diplomatic and consular officers can be notified.

## International Joint Commission To Study Passamaquoddy Power Project

[Released to the press November 9]

The Department of State announced on November 9 that the Governments of the United States and Canada have agreed to refer certain matters in connection with the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project to the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

The Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project as originally proposed in the 1920's would involve damming Passamaquoddy Bay, on the Maine-New

Brunswick border, and Cobscook Bay, which lies wholly within the State of Maine, and—by means of a controlled flow between the two basins thus formed—utilizing the great tidal range in the Bay of Fundy for the generation of hydroelectric power.

Under the terms of reference which have now been transmitted to the United States and Canadian Sections of the International Joint Commission by the United States Department of State and the Canadian Department of External Affairs, respectively, the Commission is asked to review existing plans for the project, to report how large and expensive an investigation would be required to determine whether any of these or other plans would be practicable, and to recommend a division of the expenses of such an investigation between the two countries. The reference does not ask the Commission to undertake the investigation, and both Governments have made it clear that they are not committed, by the present reference, to any later reference to the Commission for full investigation of the project itself.

A copy of the terms of reference follows:

November 9, 1948

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with Article IX of the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909, the Governments of Canada and the United States have agreed to refer to the International Joint Commission the following matters for joint examination and advisory report, including recommendations and conclusions:

1. To review existing plans for the construction of hydro-electric power plants at Passamaquoddy and Cobscook Bays, arms of the Bay of Fundy, which are located at the mouth of the St. Croix River, a boundary stream between the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick.
2. To report on the scope of the investigation which would be necessary, together with the estimated cost thereof, to enable the Commission to report whether any of these or other plans for using these waters is practicable, and is desirable from the point of view of public convenience and necessity.
3. To report its recommendations as to the basis on which the costs of the investigation shall be apportioned to each country.

In the conduct of its examination, and otherwise in the performance of its duties under this Reference, the International Joint Commission may utilize such information and technical data as has been acquired by the technical agencies of either Government or which may become available during the course of the investigation, thus avoiding duplication of effort and unnecessary expense.

Very truly yours,

R. A. LOVETT  
Acting Secretary

Department of State Bulletin



## Fulbright Study Grants Available to 47 U.S. Citizens

Opportunities for 47 United States citizens to receive grants for study, research, and teaching in Greece and the Philippines under the Fulbright program were announced on November 3 by the State Department and the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

Candidates for all grants will be selected on the basis of scholastic and professional achievement. In addition, grants for research work will be based on the research project proposed. Persons receiving grants will normally be expected to remain in Greece for one academic year. Veterans will be given preference provided that their qualifications are approximately equal to those of other candidates.

### Greece

The awards will be in Greek currency and vary in amount with the type of grants. Benefits to students may include tuition, maintenance, and travel, and those to researchers and teachers may include travel, maintenance, and a stipend.

Six grants will go to American graduate students to study at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. Study may be undertaken in the fields of ancient history, classics and classical archeology, medieval and modern Greek history, and literature. Application for these student grants should be made to the Institute of International Education, 2 West 45th Street, New York 19, New York. The closing date for filing applications for the student grants is December 15, 1948.

Eight research scholar grants are available for work under the direction of the American School of Classical Studies in connection with archeological excavations of the agora, the ancient market place in Athens.

Grants are also available to three American college or university teachers to instruct at universities and advanced schools in Greece. The following fields are available: American life and history at the University of Athens and home economics and rural sociology at the Superior School of Agriculture. The work of the rural sociologist will involve field work in cooperation with the Near East Foundation. Applications for these grants and for the research-scholar awards should be made to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C.

At least six grants are available for teaching at American-sponsored secondary schools and junior colleges in Greece. The teaching opportunities are primarily for instruction in the English language at the following schools: Pierce College, Athens College, and Anatolia College. It is likely that

opportunities for other fields of instruction may be available at a later date. Application for these grants should be made to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D.C.

In addition to the above grants offered to American citizens, it is expected that a number of scholarships will soon be made available to Greek students attending American schools in Greece, and that a limited number of travel grants to Greek nationals will be made to enable the recipients to attend colleges and universities in the United States.

### Philippines

All awards are in Philippine currency. Benefits to students may include tuition, maintenance, and travel. Recipients of grants for teaching or advanced research may be awarded travel, maintenance, and a stipend.

Four grants are available for American graduate students to engage in study or research in the Philippines. Application blanks for these grants may be obtained from the Institute of International Education, 2 West 45th Street, New York 19, New York. Closing date for filing applications is December 15, 1948.

Sixteen grants are available for American college or university teachers to instruct at universities and advanced schools in the Philippines in the fields indicated.

#### *University of the Philippines*

Economics  
Higher education  
Political science  
Psychology  
English  
Physics

#### *Silliman University*

Agriculture

#### *Santo Tomás*

Secondary education

#### *Ateneo de Manila*

Social science  
Biological science

#### *Philippine Women's University*

Nutritional chemistry  
Educational psychology  
Institutional management

#### *Philippine School of Arts and Trades*

Vocational education

#### *Philippine Normal School*

English language  
Adult education

November 21, 1948

Four grants are available for advanced research: Two at Silliman University in the field of biological sciences with emphasis on microphotography, and two at the University of the Philippines, one in the field of rural sociology, and the other in the general field of Far Eastern anthropology.

Applications for the research grants and the grants to American college or university teachers should be made to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D.C.

The remainder of the Fulbright program approved for the Philippines consists of forty travel grants to enable Filipino students to attend colleges and universities in the United States. All but six of these grants have been awarded. Four grants are available for Filipino students to attend American institutions in the Philippines.

### Surplus Property Agreement on Educational Exchange With France Signed<sup>1</sup>

The French Government and the United States Government, represented, respectively, by Messrs. Schuman and Yvon Delbos on the one hand, and by Mr. Jefferson Caffery on the other hand, signed on October 2 at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs an agreement regarding exchanges in the field of higher education. This agreement prescribes the methods for applying the Blum-Byrnes agreements of May 28, 1946, and the American law which resulted from the initiative of Senator Fulbright, which provides for the allocation of a portion of the sums in francs owed by the French Government for war surplus for the purpose of setting up a program of inter-university relations between the two countries. The United States Government has just concluded similar agreements with Great Britain and Belgium. For the purpose of carrying out the program in question, the agreement sets up a committee, of which the United States Ambassador is the honorary chairman, to be composed of six French and six American members. The funds placed at the disposal of the committee by the American Government will make it possible to finance the living expenses of a certain number of American teachers, students, and researchers who will come to France to pursue their work at institutions of higher education; the funds will also cover the traveling expenses of a certain number of French teachers, students, and researchers who will go to the United States for a similar purpose. The total amount of the sums allocated to the carrying out of this plan may reach a maximum of five million dollars, distributed over five years.

<sup>1</sup> Printed from telegraphic text.

### Colombian Anthropologist Visiting U.S. Museums

Luis Duque Gómez, Director of the National Ethnological Institute and of the National Anthropological Museum, Bogotá, has arrived in Washington for a three months' visit in the United States under the travel-grant program of the Department of State in cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution. Mr. Duque Gómez is interested in studying museum techniques and Latin American collections in this country and in encouraging specialists and students in the field of anthropology to visit and study in Colombia. After approximately two weeks in Washington, he will visit museums in various other cities in the East, on the Pacific Coast, and in the Southwest.

After completing his visit in the United States, Mr. Duque Gómez plans to continue his study and observations for a month in Mexico and Guatemala and possibly in other Central American countries before returning to Colombia next March.

### THE DEPARTMENT

#### Appointment of Officers

Elbert G. Mathews as Chief of the Division of South Asian Affairs, effective October 3, 1948.

#### Final Volume in "Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression" Series Released

The Department of the Army announced on October 31 that with the release of a volume containing the high lights of the defense made by the major Nazi war criminals, as well as their interrogations by the prosecution, publication of all the essential documents pertaining to the international trial at Nürnberg is completed.

The new volume, supplement "B", in the "Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression" series, is being sold with supplement "A" as a six-dollar set by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Supplement "A", completed several months ago, contains the six closing arguments for the Allied prosecution and prosecution documents introduced in cross-examination.

This is the eleventh and final volume in the international trial series. The Department pointed out that the preceding volumes in the series were devoted largely to prosecution documents, whereas the final volume presents the defendants' side of the case, thus achieving for the series both sides of this historical record.

The publication includes the texts of defense counsels' extensive summations of the evidence in favor of their clients; the final pleas made to the International Military Tribunal by each defend-

ant in person at the close of the evidence; defense arguments challenging the Tribunal's jurisdiction and the criminality of aggressive war; and some of the documents offered by defendants Hess and Speer which are possessed of unique significance.

This final volume, like the others in the series, has been edited by former members of the American prosecution staff at Nürnberg and has been approved for release by Justice Jackson.

## PUBLICATIONS

### Department of State

*For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.*

**Inter-American Coffee Agreement.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1768. Pub. 3247. 18 pp. 10¢.

Protocol Between the United States and Other American Republics Modifying and Extending for One Year From October 1, 1947, the Agreement of November 28, 1940, as modified and amended—entered into force with respect to the United States May 24, 1948, effective October 1, 1947.

**Settlement of Lend-Lease and Reciprocal Aid Accounts And Intergovernmental Claims.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1770. Pub. 3249. 8 pp. 5¢.

Agreement Between the United States and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Modifying and Supplementing Agreement of March 27, 1946—Signed at Washington July 12, 1948; entered into force July 12, 1948.

**Mutual Aid Settlement.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1779. Pub. 3264. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement Between the United States and Yugoslavia signed at Washington July 19, 1948; entered into force July 19, 1948.

**Economic Cooperation With Ireland Under Public Law 472—80th Congress.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1788. Pub. 3269. 42 pp. 15¢.

Agreement Between the United States and Ireland—Signed at Dublin June 28, 1948; entered into force July 2, 1948.

**Economic Cooperation With Belgium Under Public Law 472—80th Congress.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1781. Pub. 3279. 55 pp. 15¢.

Agreement Between the United States and Belgium—Signed at Brussels July 2, 1948; entered into force July 29, 1948.

**Civil Aviation Mission to Ecuador.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1774. Pub. 3285. 7 pp. 5¢.

Agreement Between the United States and Ecuador—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Quito October 24 and 27, 1947; entered into force October 27, 1947.

**Economic Cooperation With Sweden Under Public Law 472—80th Congress.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1793. Pub. 3287. 52 pp. 15¢.

Agreement Between the United States and Sweden—Signed at Stockholm July 3, 1948; entered into force July 21, 1948.

**National Commission News, November 1948.** Pub. 3321. 10 pp. 10¢ a copy; \$1 a year domestic; \$1.35 a year foreign.

Features the Boston meeting of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

**Mutual Aid Settlement: Joint Installations in the Middle East.** Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1769. Pub. 3248. 10 pp. 5¢.

Agreement Between the United States and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland—Signed at Washington July 12, 1948; entered into force July 12, 1948.

## *Documents and State Papers for October 1948*

### Contains the following items:

**The Present Status of the Saar**

**Coordination of European Inland Transport, 1941—48**

**Calendar of International Meetings With Annotations**

Copies of this publication are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at 30 cents a copy; subscription price for 12 issues is \$3.00 a year.



# Contents

<b>The U.N. and Specialized Agencies</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Economic Affairs—Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
General Assembly Considers Steps for Reduction of Armaments. Statement by Frederick H. Osborn in Committee I . . .	630	Visas Not Required for Americans on Temporary Visits to U.K. . . . .	648
Progress Report on Conditions of Refugees in Near East . . . . .	634	International Joint Commission To Study Passamaquoddy Power Project . . . .	648
Reports of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans . . . . .	635	<b>International Information and Cultural Affairs</b>	
The U.S. in the U.N. . . . .	636	Fulbright Study Grants Available to 47 U.S. Citizens . . . . .	649
U.S. Delegations to Conferences:		Surplus Property Agreement on Educational Exchange With France Signed . . . .	650
Fourth Session of FAO . . . . .	639	Colombian Anthropologist Visiting U.S. Museums . . . . .	650
UNESCO: General Conference . . . . .	640	<b>Treaty Information</b>	
<b>Occupation Matters</b>		Announcement of Intention To Enter Tariff Negotiations: Procedure To Be Followed by the U.S. . . . .	642
U.S. Interest in Revival of Japanese Economy on Peaceful Self-supporting Basis. Statement by Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy . . . . .	645	Committee for Reciprocity Information . .	643
Procedure for Filing War Claims in U.S. Zone of Germany . . . . .	646	Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. . . . .	644
<b>General Policy</b>		Ratification Instruments Exchanged Between U.S. and Norway . . . . .	646
Murder of Irving Ross in Austria Under Investigation . . . . .	646	International Commission for Scientific Investigation of Tuna Recommended . .	647
<b>Economic Affairs</b>		Surplus Property Agreement on Educational Exchange With France Signed . . . .	650
Natural Resources in a World of Conflict. Article by Paul H. Nitze . . . . .	623	<b>The Department</b>	
U.S. Delegations to Conferences:		Appointment of Officers . . . . .	650
ILO: Petroleum . . . . .	638	<b>Publications</b>	
British Parliamentary Association . . . .	638	Final Volume in Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression Series Released . . . . .	650
Air Navigation in Southeast Asia . . . .	639	Department of State. . . . .	651
Second Inter-American Congress on Brucellosis . . . . .	641		
Procedure for Filing Claims With Finland. .	647		